



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0591GA-1 for Early County School System

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant's vision is based on the concept that to accelerate student achievement, deepen learning, and increase equity a system of personalized learning must be employed. This will be supported by extensive student services and based on student academic interests. Students will begin experiencing this tailored form of education beginning in Grade 3. The grant proposal provides a comprehensive plan that establishes 4 academic academies with a specific focus. As students enter high school they will apply to attend one of the academies. The vision is that through this model all aspects of a student's preparation for adulthood including-academic, social, physical and emotional will be met.</p> <p>The applicant shares that some classes may be "designed for students who need higher-than-grade level work, and some classes will be designed for students who need remediation or intense intervention to master standards". No evidence was provided indicating this is considered a best instructional practice as "tracking" has had mixed results in many districts. Differentiation of instruction would also address the concerns of varying rates of learning and skill acquisition.</p> <p>District proposes to expand their data management systems and provide numerous resources to access the data by all stakeholders. They have demonstrated their alignment with state and national regulations and shared financial management procedures that closely monitor district work.</p> <p>Applicant describes how recruiting, developing, rewarding and retaining effective teachers will be approached. Extensive training will be offered, teachers can request teaching assignments at the secondary level, ample compensation will be offered to staff for training, a salary incentive or merit pay program will be initiated. The proposal does not state how these activities will be sustained following the conclusion of the grant. Significant grant monies are budgeted for this.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district has an alternative academic program housed in separate location. The program will continue to be a "Learning Opportunities Academy". An addition of a Graduation Counselor is appropriate. Other plans appear confusing and restrictive as no information is shared regarding if the current alternative school would be transformed or if students currently enrolled in the alternative school are eligible to apply for one of the other academies.</p> <p>Adequate attached charts and narrative shared indicates that all schools are participating and the total number of students, disaggregated by sub-group is included.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Proposal outlines a 5 step implementation process that is quite rigorous and includes a number of new initiatives to support the overall goal that at graduation all students will be career and college ready and possess the skills to be successful in their endeavors.</p> <p>The establishment of the proposed academies will result in teachers being reassigned, trained and relocated during the spring-</p>		

summer of 2013. No preliminary planning/brainstorming activity is outlined in the proposal, which may indicate insufficient institutional preparation for such major change.

As noted in the proposal, "The first step will be to hold community meetings in the spring of 2012/3 to provide parents with information about the new learning academies that will be available for all students". No plans were shared indicating a dialog with parents and students will take place. It is unclear how the selection process will be devised.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)

10

10

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA's beliefs are outlined "performance on summative assessments will increase if students are involved in their own learning and if they are allowed to make decisions related to how they will master standards."

"Moving to an academy approach that is based on student interest will change the environment and the attitudes of both students and teachers and will give all of our students the impetus they need to be successful academically and socially."

Ample research was shared to support these beliefs. Sample citation: "Uncovering the "Secrets" of Poverty". District will use the new Georgia State CCRPI, which uses multiple indicators to show success of the academy approach. The district also did field research by contacting school in other areas of the country who has successfully implemented this approach.

They proposal includes extensive data in the charts on student performance, achievement gap analysis and graduation rates to establish an accurate baseline for this project.

## B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	10
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
The grant gives minimal information regarding the alternative school. Lacking is the alternative school student performance data. It is unclear what the graduation rate is for this group of high needs students and challenges faced in providing educational alternatives.		
At certain grade levels, such as middle school, gaps are significant in math and ELA. District indicates that previous reforms implemented did have a positive effect but it was not as extensive as hoped. These strategies included Reading First and 3 Year old Pre-K program. These grant funded programs were abandoned at their conclusion though the key components have been incorporated into existing program when possible.		
Proposal details the strategies, resources and procedures that will be utilized to gather, analyze, and report student data findings to staff, students and parents. These resources such as "Power School" are outlined in the appendix.		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
Applicant provides extensive information regarding personnel salaries. Also shares non-personnel expenditures that will be supported by the district and by the proposed grant.		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	8
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:		
Proposal outlines how the district will develop a personalized learning environment within the constructs of all state legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements.		
Implementation of the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards is already occurring.		
Plans to expand the use of the Georgia Virtual School and E2020computer program are mentioned.		

Other examples of having successful conditions established were shared: High School Gold and Blue Card program to recognize academic achievement; Inclusion and self-contained classrooms for students who need additional academic support.

A concern to note that was vaguely addressed in the proposal is that economically disadvantaged students may not have 24/7 access to virtual course offerings since they possibly do not have personal technology available nor home access to internet services.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	10
---	----	----

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Through extensive outreach the district engaged all community partners (business, higher education, community agencies, staff, students, parents) and build solid support for the concepts of this proposal. Numerous letters of support were received (see appendix)

Initial planning stages of grant development included face-to-face focus group discussion and on-line surveying for all stakeholders. A planning team representing a cross section of these groups assisted in grant concept development.

District has established a Federal Programs Parent Advisory Council to assist in planning and budgeting federal grant programs.

Teachers were petitioned for support of this initiative and a range of 77-100% was reported.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	2
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant shares analysis of current needs and gaps but does not provide a logic model. Specific needs are outlined; strategies are discussed but not directly connected in the narrative.

## C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	15

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Proposal effectively outlines how the academies will function. Students will take high interest courses and core courses in the academy of their choice. District will provide opportunity for parents and students to meet with graduation coaches to develop their personal academic plan. Teachers will also provide counseling, and support to struggling students.

This plan provides options for students to excel and not be held to "seat time" standards. Students who require remediation will also be provided personalized support.

All students will understand the connection between theory and real world application of the knowledge they obtain. This plan proposes to provide more flexibility and student choice in making decisions about "how to learn and how to gather information to find solutions that are relevant to real life experiences."

Examples are shared in the narrative that demonstrates how the move to national standards and to the academies configuration will focus on higher -order thinking skills and generate creativity.

An emphasis on career and college readiness is planned to be incorporated in all classes beginning in elementary school.

An extensive list of online resources will be used for instruction, data analysis and reporting. Thinkgate, Power School, Kahn Academy and Renzulli Online are examples.

Grant application outlines the staff areas of responsibility and how these individuals will support initiatives of the grant including working with various stakeholder groups, providing oversight, training, and planning.

Needs of student subgroups identified in the gap analysis are noted and responses indicated.

The grant proposal states that "students will have increased access to online resources that allow them the ability to set learning goals and monitor their progress and their mastery of standards." Training in technology use will be provided to

students and parents. Technology labs will be open after hours to provide family access. This could inhibit use as the individual must go to the school to use the computer.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	19
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant describes how recruiting, developing, rewarding and retaining effective teachers will be approached. Extensive training will be offered, teachers can request teaching assignments at the secondary level, amply compensation will be offered to staff for training, a salary incentive or merit pay program will be initiated. The proposal does not state how these activities will be sustained following the conclusion of the grant. Significant grant monies are budget for this.

Applicant notes that "equity will be provided as all teachers will be trained intensively in personalized learning and best practices, student support...may include counseling and support for parents and families." This strategy could become incompatible with academic goals as typically teachers rely on the expertise of trained professionals to address issues of family dynamics and crisis.

It is expected that teachers will be more flexible and resourceful when providing the resources each student needs. Identifying this challenge early on has allowed the district to articulate their expectations in this area and align resources to support the teacher's efforts.

The proposal addresses offering an equitable quality education for all students by increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals. Training in best practices and the skills to differentiate instruction are listed as essential. Grant does not address the steps needed following training to insure the teacher uses these new techniques effectively. In another part of the narrative a description of team and grade level meeting s to discuss student [progress are mentioned. This may provide an option to talk about best practice implementation.

The narrative also notes "On line courses will be created and offered by our highly effective teachers. If, for some reason a student were to have access to a teacher who had been found to be weak in a particular area, components of online courses could be used to supplement...In this way, all students will have access to the most effective teachers in the system." A concern is that some students are not successful when learning in a virtual environment only. Negative interactions may occur between the student and the "weak" teacher.

## D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	14

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant notes that central office is already organized to provide support and services to each school. Detailed descriptions of leadership positions are provided.

Proposal outlines the autonomy and authority the building level leadership enjoys, the school leadership team has flexibility and autonomy to independently create school schedules and calendars that do not necessarily align with sister schools.

School leadership team helps determine roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators as well as school level budgets.

Grant proposal outlines how students will have the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic. It also proposes to allow students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times in multiple comparable ways.

These options will provide innovative solutions to age old problems of student engagement. Access to learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable will be available to all students. These strategies provide flexibility and addresses student learning styles.

Applicant did not share mechanism that will be used to initiate this process with the student.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Proposal states "infrastructure supports personalized learning by ensuring that all students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders, regardless of income, will have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school" . It also notes "Allowing students to bring their own technology alleviates the amount of manpower required to maintain schools full of devices". The District also recognized that some students will not be able to afford these devices so they plan to provide access to about 10% of the students by providing devices to be used at school. This still does not resolve the issue of home access to internet based educational experiences.</p> <p>Open source technology resources, student data/parent portal, access to purchased instructional software are all included in the proposal.</p> <p>District proposes to expand their data management systems and provide numerous resources to access the data by all stakeholders. They have demonstrated their alignment with state and national regulations and shared financial management procedures that closely monitor district work.</p>		

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district created a long range plan by working with the GLISI Leadership Framework for System Improvement. This document along with current data provides a Launchpad for this proposal. The district proposes to purchase the GLISI's Balanced Scoreboard to provide electronic, public communication of all goals and progress made in every area. Mechanisms at all levels have been proposed to gather data, measure and monitor progress. Using these resources revisions will be proposed, discussed and implemented.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>District will form a RTT District Council which includes representatives from all stakeholder groups. They will receive monthly updates of progress. It is not made clear if they will function as an advisory committee to the District.</p> <p>All media outlets will be used to report progress. District also plans two-way communication and engagement by collecting information form surveys, discussions, feedback sessions, focus groups. It is not shared how all this information will be considered when making program adjustments etc.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Improving teacher effectiveness will be supported by the Teacher Keys Effectiveness System and Leader Keys Effectiveness System. The new Georgia Student Growth Model will be employed too.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>District proposes to utilize staff and leadership meetings to assess progress of grant initiatives; this will be cross-referenced with performance data and teacher input. Parent and community comments will be considered also.</p> <p>Mechanisms to conduct focused discussions with representatives from all stakeholder groups, regarding the success of the academies is possible, but not specifically outlined in the grant.</p>		

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	9
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>District hopes to increase enrollment due to the new initiative proposed. They have made a commitment to transition grant funded positions whenever possible to a similar position in the district. Extensive records are shared indicating funds supporting the project. One time investments are noted. Extensive information shared regarding detail of proposed purchases, staff costs etc. Also key financial is share din the appendices.</p> <p>Applicant describes how recruiting, developing, rewarding and retaining effective teachers will be approached. Extensive training will be offered, teachers can request teaching assignments at the secondary level, amply compensation will be offered to staff for training, a salary incentive or merit pay program will be initiated. The proposal states in general terms how these activities will be sustained following the conclusion of the grant. Significant grant monies are budget for this.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	8
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant discusses plans to utilize local and state government funding to support grant initiatives. Also discusses realigning staff to cover some of the new services created during grant implementation. Review of budget document shows that much of the grant funds allocated will be used for personnel costs- salary, fringe benefits, training, travel expenses. The district hopes to see an increase in student enrollment, but does not share strategies to increase enrollment.</p>		

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	10
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Proposal outlines many partnerships that exist within the county structure. The premise is to share the burden among many to reduce impact on one entity. There is an array of services available and the school district is a partner who greatly benefits from the work done by coalitions such as the Early County Family Connections, Early County Literacy Task Force and the Rotary Club, and the Early County Multi-Disciplinary Team. Regional and state affiliations also help the district address critical student and family issues.</p> <p>Letters of support and participation in advisory councils etc. indicate that Early county School District is a contributing member of this network of services.</p>		

## Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Early County school district has proposed a total revision of their educational program structure. The academies concept creates extensive opportunities to establish and operate personalized learning environments throughout the district. The District has included all stakeholder groups throughout the planning and proposal process. The successful working relationship between the student and teacher will ensure the project met its objective. Plans to increase the competence and expertise of the instructional and leadership staff are also delineated. Parents are active partners in the education of their child. Student performance data will be used extensively to monitor and adjust instruction to meet student needs. This project does meet the expectation of Absolute Priory 1.</p>		

Total	210	174
-------	-----	-----



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0591GA-2 for Early County School System

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(A)(1) Score = 7 /10</p> <p>Early County School System (ECSS) is requesting \$9,998,665 to implement their vision for a personalized learning environment for 2,215 students in rural Georgia.</p> <p>ECSS has put forth a strong vision statement for the transformation of their school district using the personalized learning environment initiative. They envision creating learning academies, STEM, Fine Arts, Vocational, and Advanced Academics. They also envision offering courses in a hybrid format using online learning technologies.</p> <p>A strong component of this proposal is training of teachers in personalized learning best practices including knowing how to design lessons to meet the needs and interests of each child in a classroom setting. Two possible tools to assist that have been identified are: Renzulli Online Learning and Khan Academy. Additionally, ECSS is integrating the College and Career Ready Performance Index (CCRPI) into their grades levels and content areas to focus upon content mastery.</p> <p>Of significance is their vision of transforming their system of education from factory based to the 21<sup>st</sup> century model where the whole child is considered.</p> <p>What is missing is a clearer, more comprehensive view of what each of the four core educational areas will transform into as a result of requested grant funds awarded. Also, a more refined set of distinctions to know what is meant by socio-emotional needs of their students, or how to offer new curricula using technology resources, or how common core standards and CCRPI will change their school culture, as examples.</p> <p>Overall this places ECSS at the top of the middle range.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(A)(2) Score = 7 /10</p> <p>ECSS will include all four schools in their district, where the graduation rate in 2010-2011 was 82.8% with the goal of 87.0% for 2011-2012.</p> <p>As the entire district will be involved in the implementation of this grant there is no selection process required.</p> <p>What is missing is a description of their approach to select teachers and development them professionally, to involve students from low income, rural area where only 13.5% of the town's population has a college degree, among other challenges.</p> <p>Overall this places ECSS at the top of the middle range.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	7

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

(A)(3) Score = 7 /10

ECSS proposes to establish Academies that will assist students in aligning their interests with academic programs. Further, they propose to offer work experiences through partnerships with local businesses to reinforce a career and college focus.

ECSS proposes a 5 step implementation plan:

1. Inform parents and the community of the new school-within-school, academies restructuring through a series of town meetings.
2. Develop student data profiles to include academic achievement, student interests, student future goals
3. Students, parents meet with school counselors, teachers and administrators to determine which academy and program will be the best fit
4. Students will apply to the appropriate academic program

Of particular significance for allowing work-based curricula seat time requirements will be altered to allow for competency based learning.

The proposed utilization of the NAGC framework to assess students from a whole child perspective is useful and will serve the district to develop individualized learning plans for each student.

Teachers will also have the opportunity to teach in an academy or various academies base upon their interests and strengths. They will also be able to develop new hybrid courses using new technologies along with new teaching methods such as differentiated learning, which are at the heart of personalizing the learning for each student. Thinkgate and GLIS are such technologies that will be used to design lessons that are self paced and allow teachers to capture data on progress. ECSS envisions developing a more robust data capture and analysis system to more effectively track student growth and progress.

What is missing is a description of the change process, how will implementing the above four steps assist the district in creating a personalized learning environment.

Overall this places ECSS at the top of the middle range.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)

10

7

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(A)(4) Score = 7/10

ECSS has a focused attention on the use of data to establish academic achievement goals. For the subgroup African-American they propose to increase 6<sup>th</sup> grade math proficiency scores from 69% in 2011 to 76% at the end of the grant period in 2015-16. To accomplish increased academic achievement and improve graduation rates they propose utilizing graduation coaches, a K-12 science coach, and K-5 math coach.

Eliminating seat time requirements to allow students to learn outside traditional classroom environments and at their own pace is a key strategy to increasing the students with disabilities subgroup 39% graduation rate to 59.1% in 2015-16 (Table (A)(4)(c)).

ECSS quoted numerous studies where best practices for improving student achievement gaps were discussed; however, they did not describe their own views for how to implement these practices.

Overall this place ECSS at the top of the middle range.

## B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	15

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(B)(1) Score = 15/15

ECSS has demonstrated a strong record of closing achievement gaps, examples include:

1. Early County Elementary, the achievement gap between White students and Black students in grades 3-5 in math on the



State assessment (CRCT) has decreased from 23.1% in 2007-

2008 to 8.5% in 2010-2011.

2. Between White students and ED students, the gap has decreased from 20.6% to 5.8% in that same timeframe. Between White students and SWDs, the gap has closed from 39.1% to 19.5%.

3. High school graduation rates have increased overall from 79.4% in 2008-2009 to an estimated 88% in 2011-2012.

It is impressive that ECSS has not had to close under performing schools. Of significance is the implementation of an early reading, grant funded program which has contributed to increased reading scores throughout the district.

The use of Power School information system has enhanced the data the is reported to the community through a parent portal.

Overall this places ECSS at the high end of the high range.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)

5

3

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(B)(2) Score = 3/5

ECSS makes school level data available to the public through the Data Collection Report and DE-46 Financial form required by the Georgia Department of Education.

Even though these reports were included in the Appendix, they are not easy to use for the average parent, and the work of interpreting these reports is left up to the individual which limits the level of transparency in reporting.

Overall this places ECSS at the top of the middle range.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)

10

8

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

(B)(3) Score = 8/10

ECSS is in the process of implementing the Common Core Standards and with coordination of the Georgia Department of Education they are allowed flexibility in how to implement these which is an important characteristic when implementing a personalized learning environment. ECSS has a dual enrollment program with Bainbridge College to become certified as nursing assistant, this forms a firm foundation from which to build additional programs to meet the individual needs of students.

What is missing is a process for scaling outside project based learning to demonstrate competencies such as making changes to seat-time policies which will be critical to the success of the personalized learning initiative proposed.

Overall this places ECSS at the bottom of the high range.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)

10

8

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(B)(4) Score = 8/10

ECSS has recently engaged the entire community through their strategic planning process. Of particular significance is the involvement of the PTO in this planning and budgeting process. 77% of elementary school teachers approved this proposal, 91% of middle school teachers, 87% of high school teachers, and 100% of alternative high school teachers. The local chamber of commerce is very supportive as are the Patuala Center for Children's Advocacy, and Family Connections/FACES.

What is missing is local teacher's union support and involvement in the process.

Overall this places ECSS at the bottom of the high range.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

2

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

(B)(5) Score = 2/5

ECSS has identified the acute need of engaging and motivating students, where teachers have not been trained in methods to fully engage students in their learning. The popular and effective teaching method of Differentiated Learning has been taught, however teachers are reluctant to embrace this newer method to attempt to personalize their instruction for each of their students. This is a concern as the district proposes to go further into personalizing the teaching and learning using requiring a differentiated approach along with self paced, project based learning integrated with multi-media technology applications such as Khan Academy videos, among others.

The ECSS plan does not mention how it will motivate and engage all teachers in using these newer personalized methods to achieve grant funding goals and results.

Overall this places ECSS at the bottom of the middle range.

## C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(C)(1) Score = 14 /20

ECSS has a clear focus for the reorganization of their school district to the academies model as the key strategy to personalize the learning for each student. Additionally, the district is in the process of realigning their curriculum from the Georgia Performance Standards to the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards. Students learning these standards within their chosen academy will challenge them to know and understand their learning plan with learning goals without a comprehensive personalized learning plan. Further, even though Khan Academy type multi-media learning tools have been referenced, the monitoring of student progress against the PLP has not been discussed nor an approach to one-to-one computing using mobile devices, which engages and motivates students and allows for greater flexibility when completing real-world assignments.

Finally, there is an overreliance upon coaches, e.g. K-6 math coach, or K-12 Graduation coach, instead of a teacher professional development plan that assists them in making the critical shift from sage on the stage, using traditional teaching

methods, to guide on the side using coaching methods in the classroom as a part of their instruction. This missing information and discussion weakens the implementation plan for student learning.

Overall this places ECSS at the top of the middle range for this criterion.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)

20

14

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(C)(2) Score = 14/20

ECSS has proposed using an outside vendor for professional development training of teachers to make the shift to methods required in a personalized learning environment, PD 360, as well as participate in Teachers as Advisors training. ECSS has a solid teacher development plan with very extensive training over the grant period.

ECSS is currently using outdated teacher evaluation and principal evaluation systems, the Teacher Keys Effectiveness Measurement System (TKES) and the Leader Keys Effectiveness System (LKES). CLASS Keys, is a Georgia instrument that introduced in 2007, and is in the process of modification to include new observation methods, ratings, and evidence artifacts to include student achievement data. The design of new evaluation systems will continue throughout the life of the grant.

What is missing from this analysis and discussion are the new and updated criteria that teachers and principals will be evaluated that positively reinforce the shift to their proposed personalized learning environment.

Overall this places ECSS at the top of the middle range for this criterion.

## D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	11
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (D)(1) Score = 11/15  ECSS has a clear focus on the use of the districts two Assistant Superintendents to manage and implement the RTT –D grant. Considering all of the changes proposed, this is a considerable challenge to place the additional responsibly upon these two individuals. In addition, the understanding that seat time requirements will need to be changed to promote mastery of learning as demonstrated through competencies, the discussion about how to make these policy changes with the state department of education has not been comprehensive.  Overall this places ECSS at the top of the middle range.		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (D)(2) Score = 5/10  ECSS will rely upon their current BYOT, bring your own technology approach to one-to-one computing and personalized learning. Equitable personalized learning environments require integration of technology into curricula that is available to all		

teachers and students and administrators equally. What is missing from this approach is the understanding that to personalize the learning using multi-media tools such as those offered by Khan Academy, that allow for the on-going measurement of student progress toward a personalized learning plan, at the same time a key teacher development strategy is to allow teachers to design their own eLearning lessons, within the context of a rural, low socio-economic community, a comprehensive strategy would include one consistent an required technology platform.

Overall this places ECSS in the middle of the middle range.

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	10
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(E)(1) Score = 10/15</p> <p>ECSS has a framework in place to evaluate the change process and make improvements when required, the GLISI Leadership Framework for System Improvement. This framework assists teachers and administrators identify areas of improvement, then within the team based cause analysis and suite of solutions, action plans are formulated and implemented. As a framework this can be highly effective. However, as clearly stated in their discussion, a considerable obstacle to change is staffs buy in, a concern. What is missing is a strategy to address this identified obstacle to change.</p> <p>Overall this places ECSS at the high end of the middle range.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(E)(2) Score = 4 /5</p> <p>ECSS has communication plan that includes two way communication between the RTT-D council and numerous stakeholders that includes using GLISI Balanced Scoreboard information. What is missing is a mechanism for teachers to report their progress in applying new training, new programs, new approaches to teaching and learning through multi-media formats.</p> <p>Overall this places ECSS at the high end of the high range.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(E)(3) Score = 3/5</p> <p>ECSS has a clear understanding of the achievement gap issues and concerns in their district between white students and various subgroups. What is missing are specific goals for narrowing the gaps, along with new measures demonstrating that students are developing the softer skills, such as communication, collaboration, et al, as required in college and career ready standards, along with socio-emotional and behavioral measures. Goals for students applying college and graduation rates have not been thoroughly discussed. Additionally, ECSS proposes using DIBELS scores as measures of reading and comprehension, within the context of newer Common Core standards for demonstrating competencies including higher order cognitive processes, these measures are limiting as the school culture changes to a personalized learning environment.</p> <p>Overall this places ECSS at the top end of the middle range.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

(E)(4) Score = 4/5

ECSS has established clear use for grant funds that are consistent with successful implementation, management, and assessment for the grant period and beyond. What is missing is a more complete analysis of the professional development training required for all teachers, and allocations for the use of technology.

Overall this places ECSS in the low end of the high range.

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (F)(1) Score = 5/10  ECSS budget proposal allocates \$6.5 million of the total \$9.9 million requested for additional personnel such as K-12 graduation coaches, K-6 math coaches, among others. This allocation does not represent the most acute needs within the district for teacher professional development and new mobile technology devices.  Overall this place ECSS in the middle of middle range.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (F)(2) Score = 5/10  ECSS will require additional funding sources beyond the grant period to fund the additional personnel, coaches and staff, as well as those extended learning opportunities such as after school programs, work-based learning projects, among others. These sources have not been identified and therefore are of concern.  Overall this places ECSS in the middle of the middle range.		

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	5
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: Competitive Preference Priority Score = 5/10  ECSS has proposed a significant number of key partnerships, most prominent is the "Early County Family Connection FACES (ECFC) which is one of 159 county collaboratives funded by the state of Georgia to serve as the local decision-making body for its community. ECFC is responsible for developing and coordinating a strategic plan to improve outcomes for children, families, and the community." Further, the level of integration among the local institutions with the schools is not strong, and therefore the socio-emotional needs of students and the responsibility for improving could be seen as not being a part of the personalized learning environment within the schools and classrooms. In addition, there is a high level of integration needed among the local business community and hospital to create work-based, real-world learning opportunities for students in STEM and vocational academies.  What is missing is an approach providing additional student and family supports to schools that address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of the participating students (as defined in this notice), giving highest priority to students in participating schools with high-need students (as defined in this notice). To meet this priority, an applicant's proposal does not need to be		

comprehensive and may provide student and family supports that focus on a subset of these needs. Further, the goals for improved socio-emotional and behavior measures do not reflect the increased focused upon the whole child needs, especially in such a high need community.

This places the ECSS in the middle of the middle range.

## Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

### Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Early County School System (ECSS) is requesting \$9,998,665 to implement their vision for a personalized learning environment for 2,215 students in rural Georgia.

ECSS has put forth a strong vision statement for the transformation of their school district using the personalized learning environment initiative. They envision creating learning academies, STEM, Fine Arts, Vocational, and Advanced Academics. They also envision offering courses in a hybrid format using online learning technologies.

A strong component of this proposal is training of teachers in personalized learning best practices including knowing how to design lessons to meet the needs and interests of each child in a classroom setting. Two possible tools to assist that have been identified are: Renzulli Online Learning and Khan Academy. Additionally, ECSS is integrating the College and Career Ready Performance Index (CCRPI) into their grades levels and content areas to focus upon content mastery.

Of significance is their vision of transforming their system of education from factory based to the 21<sup>st</sup> century model where the whole child is considered.

ECSS proposes to establish Academies that will assist students in aligning their interests with academic programs. Further, they propose to offer work experiences through partnerships with local businesses to reinforce a career and college focus.

ECSS proposes a 5 step implementation plan:

1. Inform parents and the community of the new school-within-school, academies restructuring through a series of town meetings.
2. Develop student data profiles to include academic achievement, student interests, student future goals
3. Students, parents meet with school counselors, teachers and administrators to determine which academy and program will be the best fit
4. Students will apply to the appropriate academic program

Of particular significance for allowing work-based curricula seat time requirements will be altered to allow for competency based learning.

The proposed utilization of the NAGC framework to assess students from a whole child perspective is useful and will serve the district to develop individualized learning plans for each student.

Teachers will also have the opportunity to teach in an academy or various academies base upon their interests and strengths. They will also be able to develop new hybrid courses using new technologies along with new teaching methods such as differentiated learning, which are at the heart of personalizing the learning for each student. Thinkgate and GLIS are such technologies that will be used to design lessons that are self paced and allow teachers to capture data on progress. ECSS envisions developing a more robust data capture and analysis system to more effectively track student growth and progress.

ECSS has demonstrated a strong record of closing achievement gaps, examples include:

1. Early County Elementary, the achievement gap between White students and Black students in grades 3-5 in math on the State assessment (CRCT) has decreased from 23.1% in 2007-

2008 to 8.5% in 2010-2011.

2. Between White students and ED students, the gap has decreased from 20.6% to 5.8% in that same timeframe. Between White students and SWDs, the gap has closed from 39.1% to 19.5%.

3. High school graduation rates have increased overall from 79.4% in 2008-2009 to an estimated 88% in 2011-2012.

It is impressive that ECSS has not had to close under performing schools. Of significance is the implementation of an early reading, grant funded program which has contributed to increased reading scores throughout the district.

ECSS has identified the acute need of engaging and motivating students, where teachers have not been trained in methods to fully engage students in their learning. The popular and effective teaching method of Differentiated Learning has been taught, however teachers are reluctant to embrace this newer method to attempt to personalize their instruction for each of their students. This is a concern as the district proposes to go further into personalizing the teaching and learning using requiring a differentiated approach along with self paced, project based learning integrated with multi-media technology applications such as Khan Academy videos, among others.

ECSS has a clear understanding of the achievement gap issues and concerns in their district between white students and various subgroups. What is missing are specific goals for narrowing the gaps, along with new measures demonstrating that students are developing the softer skills, such as communication, collaboration, et al, as required in college and career ready standards, along with socio-emotional and behavioral measures. Goals for students applying college and graduation rates have not been thoroughly discussed. Additionally, ECSS proposes using DIBELS scores as measures of reading and comprehension, within the context of newer Common Core standards for demonstrating competencies including higher order cognitive processes, these measures are limiting as the school culture changes to a personalized learning environment.

ECSS budget proposal allocates \$6.5 million of the total \$9.9 million requested for additional personnel such as K-12 graduation coaches, K-6 math coaches, among others. This allocation does not represent the most acute needs within the district for teacher professional development and new mobile technology devices.

ECSS will require additional funding sources beyond the grant period to fund the additional personnel, coaches and staff, as well as those extended learning opportunities such as after school programs, work-based learning projects, among others. These sources have not been identified and therefore are of concern.

Overall the ECSS proposal is well conceived however with considerations for grant funding success and future scalability and replication.

Total	210	144
-------	-----	-----



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

Application #0591GA-3 for Early County School System

#### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	9

#### (A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal statement that instruction will be based on student ability, interest, and career plan is well-connected to the absolute priority 1 of this program.

The overall vision of reforming schools into academies where students can focus on interest areas is well-connected to the

purpose of this grant program.

There is a strong emphasis on instruction being connected to student need. This demonstrates a strong commitment to reform as well as student-centered learning.

Overall there is a strong theme of student-driven, data-driven education throughout the vision statement that is strongly in-line with the goals of this grant program.

No information was presented with regard to educator effectiveness (one of the core assurance areas).

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7
---	----	---

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

All students in the District will participate in grant activities. The rationale for this is strong and presents a credible position that all grades and school programs are interrelated.

Some information was provided regarding subgroups and enrollment data. However, a table displaying these enrollment figures was not provided.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	10
---	----	----

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

All schools and students in the District will participate in grant activities.

The proposal references extensive searching of best practices as the basis for the proposed reforms. These reforms are significant and include translating current educational structures into academies where instruction is student-centered.

Student choice and interest are strong components of this proposal. This is well-aligned with grant priorities. Not only will students self-select into academies, but they also had a say in what the academies would be. This demonstrates a strong commitment to student-centered, data-based instruction. The proposal demonstrates a clear understanding that the authors have thought through the entire K-12 process for their program.

Data are a common component in the proposed reform plan. Multiple types of data will be used for student placement as well as instructional planning. In addition, data on teacher interests and abilities will also be used to place students in academies. This demonstrates forethought regarding how data can be best used to inform instruction. In order to facilitate this increased data usage, the District plans to purchase and implement a new data management system in strong connection to the key assurance areas. This also includes hiring a data specialist in order for data to get to stakeholders in an efficient manner to inform instruction.

Scale up is not addressed in this section but since the entire District will participate in grant activities, this is reasonable. The content provided demonstrates significant planning in strong connection with grant priorities and assurance areas.

The proposal demonstrates an interest in using teacher incentives in innovative ways (paying teachers more for more challenging assignments). The District will also use teacher evaluation data to make raise and salary decisions in alignment with the key assurance areas.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	7
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal references research and philosophy that establishes that their plan is likely to result in student learning. The research methods cited are connected to District plans further demonstrating the likeliness of their plan to succeed in increasing student learning.

The information regarding closing achievement gaps is somewhat light on detail. It's not clear that simply providing academies on its own will decrease achievement gaps.

The proposal states that a "no seat" policy (allowing for advancement not due to time but due to mastery) will increase graduation rates. There is some evidence provided to support this. It is also in alignment with overall grant priorities. The District also plans to hire a graduation coach which could help increase graduate rates.

The District plans to offer seminars on financial aid and college-specific skills. These could increase student self-efficacy for college. An expanded AP program is also likely to increase college attendance and graduation.

Some of the outcome goals regarding summative assessments are not ambitious (Black 3rd grade math moving from 85% to



85%). Most goals are ambitious and achievable (changes in subgroup achievement).

The detail in the data provided show the District is committed to and comfortable with data use.

The District has referenced acceleration but no information was provided regarding how students who are accelerated would be evaluated.

The District plans on some achievement gaps getting significantly worse before they get better. No content is provided to explain this.

## B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	13
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal included data that demonstrate closing a certain school's Black-White achievement gap from 23% to 8%. Multiple similar sized improvements in such gaps were noted. This demonstrates a strong record of success. This also demonstrates the District also has a strong history of data use.</p> <p>High school graduation and college enrollment rates have also increased. However, no data were presented on general student achievement.</p> <p>The District presented a previous experience with a funded grant program in which they were successful in increasing student achievement. This demonstrates a history of success.</p> <p>The District demonstrated a strong commitment to data usage and reform in its history through the use of data team meetings and through the use of non-APY status as an indicator for reform.</p> <p>There was not a clear presentation of past success turning around the lowest-performing schools.</p> <p>The District demonstrated that a parent-student data system is already in place and is popular with parents. This shows a strong commitment on the part of the District to provide data to parents. Similar data systems exist for students.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	2
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal references Office of Civil Rights data completion regarding salaries. However, this does not demonstrate a strong commitment to transparency.</p> <p>The District presented information regarding state data compliance. However, this is still a barrier to public access and does not demonstrate a strong commitment to transparency.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	3
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application discusses teacher freedom in the context of standards and curriculum, but does not address larger statutory or legal structures.</p> <p>Much information is provided regarding opportunities for students, but this information does not demonstrate that the District has the ability to implement its proposed reforms.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	9
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal references meetings with community members as well as parent groups which were utilized in the planning of the strategic plan and the proposal.</p>		

Principals were also sent drafts for their comment demonstrating engagement with administration.

Examples such as the change in PE and K-2 programming show the District was responsive to stakeholders in the drafting of this proposal.

The proposal included statistics showing more than 70% approval and support from staff at all grade levels.

Overall the application demonstrates that a wide range of stakeholders were involved in the drafting of this proposal. The only group missing was students. It was unclear if students were involved in the process and what they think about it.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

1

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The information presented in this section does not address the review criteria.

The information provided in this section deals with programming and planned interventions. No information was provided regarding how student needs or gaps would be measured. Throughout the application the proposal referenced high levels of need regarding low past performance. However, a plan was not provided regarding how the specifics of students' needs would be assessed before moving forward.

## C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	12
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>a) The District's focus on academies based on student interest and careers is likely to result in establishing meaningfulness to students. No specific information was provided regarding action to assure this happens.</p> <p>The proposal states that students will develop learning and development goals in alignment with standards and their chosen academy. However, no specific details are provided on how this will happen or how this process will result in increased student learning.</p> <p>The proposal emphasizes student interest as well as connecting with teacher interest in order to assure deep learning.</p> <p>Few details are provided regarding how students will be exposed to diverse cultures. The information provided does not demonstrate a high-quality plan.</p> <p>The proposal references the collaborative nature of the academies as evidence for students learning problem solving and teamwork. This does provide some evidence, but does not demonstrate a high-quality plan.</p> <p>b) The addition of some staff and the restructuring of the schools into academies means students are more likely to graduate on time and college or career-ready. However, specifics were not provided.</p> <p>The evidence provided regarding access to diverse forms of learning deals mostly with references to teacher training and professional development. This provides some evidence that students will experience a range of learning options, it does not represent a high-quality plan.</p> <p>The proposal references that students will have the option to enroll in online or other blended learning courses as options. Several options and resources for online and independent learning are referenced. Few specifics were provided.</p> <p>The District demonstrated a strong commitment to data usage to improve instruction and match services with student needs. Additional resources will be purchased to further this priority.</p> <p>The District referenced using data to provide personalized learning environments as well as online software. This provides some evidence toward the review criteria, but does not establish a high-quality plan.</p> <p>Little data are presented regarding high-need students beyond saying that services such as counselors and resource rooms will be provided as needed.</p> <p>Students already have access to the data management system and can use this system to better manage their learning.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	8

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

a: The District already uses learning communities for professional development and support needs. Many references are made to training that will take place but few specifics are provided. The proposal referenced a professional learning plan that will be developed, but that statement alone does not represent the high-quality plan needed for the selection criteria.

Some information was provided regarding activities to take place within the academies. However, no information was provided regarding what training would take place to assure teachers had the skills to implement PLEs.

A general process for how data will be used to inform instruction and monitor progress, but no plan is presented on how teachers will be trained to use these data.

Information on training for using educator effectiveness systems to improve instruction was limited to a description of various systems. No plan was presented regarding how this information would be used to train teachers or to improve instruction.

b. No information was presented to demonstrate teachers have access to data systems. Some references were made to purchasing additional systems to facilitate this if the grant is funded. Information regarding training teachers to use data was very general and does not constitute a high-quality plan.

The District already has a technology plan in place and will use grant funds to support additional technology resources and software to improve teacher access to data and instructional tools. This is in alignment with selection criteria.

The proposal emphasized significant attention to needs-based, data-based instruction. Resources were referenced in order to support this outcome and some training information was referenced.

c. Little information was provided regarding how the teacher evaluation system data would be used. General ideas were presented regarding the closing of achievement gaps as priorities, but no plan was presented for how this would happen.

Some information was provided regarding students being taught by effective educators, but no plan was presented for how this would happen.

In general, overarching ideas were presented, but a high-quality plan (goals, objectives, measurable outcomes, responsible parties, etc.) was not provided.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	8
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Individual schools have control over their own schedules which suggests some structure is in place at the school level to allow for project implementation. The proposal references a standard central office structure as evidence that the central office is structured in a way to facilitate program implementation. However, the central office is not presented in any unique ways.</p> <p>The proposal indicates that principals and individual schools have a large degree of flexibility over school control and structure. The proposal does not reference any specific structure or changes that might indicate special levels of flexibility.</p> <p>The proposal indicated that teachers will be expected to provide students with multiple opportunities to demonstrate mastery. However, no specifics are provided regarding how this will be assured or how it will happen in practice.</p> <p>The District references providing Rosetta Stone as a learning resource, but little else is mentioned.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal references reliance on students and families to bring their own technology as part of their intervention. However, it's not clear how this will work in a District with such high poverty. This is unlikely to provide access. To address this, the District plans to provide access to computer labs as well as purchase enough devices for 10% of students. This is a reasonable accommodation.</p> <p>The District plans to provide tech support to students and families helping assure tech issues do not prevent learning. No reference was made to student-level training in classrooms or for teachers beyond stating staff will be hired to help with technology.</p>		

The District already provides easy access to student data systems for students and their parents. The District plans to expand this access through additional technology and software purchases.

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	10
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal references a continuous improvement plan and process that is already in place to help address issues before they arise. Details are provided regarding the general structure of this process. The District also plans to purchase additional data systems and software in order to provide early and frequent access to data. This demonstrates a strong commitment to early planning and ongoing revision.</p> <p>No information is provided in this section regarding measures or the public sharing of information. Later tables include information on measures and goals.</p> <p>The information provided is very general and does not demonstrate that a high-quality plan is in place to provide for ongoing revision and improvement.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>General information is provided in the proposal regarding engagement with outside groups, students, and teachers. However, no specific plans are provided to show what the District will do to maintain communication and engagement.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The District plans to implement the State-mandated teacher and leader evaluation systems as its measure of staff effectiveness. This procedure is reasonable. However, little data are provided in the application regarding baselines since the evaluation systems are not yet available. The rationale for using the measures of educator effectiveness are reasonable, but little detail on these systems was provided.</p> <p>Several of the measures discussed (e.g., PALS, DIBELS, the State Criterion Referenced Test) are reasonable for their stated purpose and to evaluate the effectiveness of the program. However, few details are provided regarding how they will provide timely feedback. The proposal does not discuss what will be done to assure feedback and data are reviewed in a timely manner.</p> <p>The proposal uses a different definition for effective and highly-effective than does the application. Because of this the quality of their proposed teacher evaluation is hard to judge.</p> <p>Several of the outcome performance measures are not ambitious (e.g., 91% of Black students taught by highly-effective teachers moving to 94% by the end of the grant). This is also true of several other indicators (e.g., other subgroups, DIBELS moving from 78% to 80%, etc.). The outcomes are achievable but are not ambitious. Much data are provided, but all follow a theme of not being ambitious.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal references that "goals are being set" - indicating that a system for evaluation is not yet in place. Statements such as "there should be increases in areas of both academic and health or social-emotional indicators as determined by the district" are made, but there are no specific plans regarding how outcomes will be evaluated. Some of this information is provided in Table E3 regarding performance measures, but the connection between these measures and internal evaluation is unclear.</p>		

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	9
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>a - The proposal states that local, state, and Federal funds will be used to support the program.</p> <p>The primary cost area for the program involves staff and materials. This is reasonable given the focus of the project on creating academies and implementing data-based instruction.</p> <p>b - The budget is reasonable to carry out grant activities.</p> <p>c - The goals and priorities referenced throughout the grant (e.g., increased graduation rates, increased student achievement, etc) match well with the budget (e.g., professional development on data usage, hiring of music and writing teachers, etc). A large range of materials will also be purchased in order to facilitate students pursuance of individual interests. One-time investments include computers and software as well as start-up professional development.</p> <p>Overall the budget is detailed and demonstrates a high level of planning.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	4
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal references the re-purposing of funds and staffing as a way to sustain the program. The proposal also states that sustainability will be established when students transfer to the District from outside. However, a high-quality plan is not provided regarding how this will happen.</p>		

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	2
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>1 - The proposal references several previous partnerships (e.g., with the Rotary, Literacy Task force, and ECFC). However, none of the partnerships presented deal with the proposed grant project. Instead, they deal with past projects. Many of the past projects are related to work the District proposes to do in the grant project (if funded - such as the literacy work) but are not for the purpose of furthering PLEs.</p> <p>2 - The proposal does not reference outcome results.</p> <p>3 - The proposal does not reference how the District or other groups would track data beyond saying it will happen. No information is provided regarding how data will be used to improve students outcomes.</p> <p>4 - The proposal does not describe how the partnerships would integrate programs and services.</p> <p>5 - The proposal references Response to Intervention as the method under which student needs will be matched with programming. This is a reasonable model, but few details are provided regarding a decision making process, how parents would be engaged, or how progress would be monitored.</p> <p>The goals presented do appear ambitious and achievable. However, they are few in number (three) which is not ambitious.</p> <p>In general this section is very light on detail and lacks specifics regarding how a partnership will be created and/or how a partnership would act to support the larger proposed reforms.</p>		

## Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not	Met

	Met	
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: The proposal demonstrates a strong commitment to personalized learning and matching the needs of students with appropriate education.		

Total	210	129
-------	-----	-----